

REMARKS

A number of claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,600,775 issued to King et al. that has been discussed in detail in previous responses. In the most current Response to Arguments, the Examiner states that Applicant's arguments filed 21 February 2006 are not persuasive in that, "the applicant states in the disclosure that the annotations are computer readable opcode (page 2 lines 19 and 20, Page 3 lines 30 – 33 and page 4 lines 14 – 16)".

As stated in the previous response, the Applicants' have amended claims 1, 15 and 21 to specifically recite the limitation that the video frame information is permanently modified therefore rendering King non-anticipatory. The Examiner is directed to page 9 line 23 of the application,

"The authoring tool records the actions of the author in memory on PC 30. The recorded actions of the author become the commentary....In some embodiments, the commentary can be run as a stand alone video title" (emphasis added). In this way, the video frame information is permanently modified in contrast to the King reference that specifically states that the original video is not modified.

Since King does not anticipate nor reasonably suggest the invention as recited in claim 1, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the 102(b) rejection.

Independent claims 15 and 21 as amended teaches a system that recites limitation essentially the same in scope to independent claim 1 and are, therefore, also allowable.


All dependent claims depend either directly or indirectly from claims 1 and/or 15 and/or 21 and are, therefore, also allowable for at least the reasons stated for claims 1 and 15 and 21 above.

The Examiner also rejected a number of other claims as being obvious under King in view of Official Notice (at page 5, second paragraph) and as being obvious under King in view of U.S. Patent 6,507,696 issued to Chung, as well as King in view of Chung, and further, in view of U.S. Patent 6,144,375 issued to Jain. It is the Applicants' belief that none of the cited references (nor the Official Notice) add to King with regard to the claimed limitations of the invention. Therefore, the Applicants believe that the secondary references fail to cure the deficiencies of King and request that the Examiner withdraw the obviousness type rejections thereof.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are allowable. Should the Examiner believe that a further telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

  
Michael J. Ferrazano  
Reg. No. 44,105

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
(650) 961-8300

BEST AVAILABLE COPY